01-10-05

PTO/SB/21 (08-03) type a plus sign (+) inside this box -> [+] Approved for use through 08/30/03. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE per the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. 10/678,979 **Application Number** TRANSMITTAL Filing Date October 2, 2003 **FORM** Stephen D. Pacetti First Named Inventor (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)-**Group Art Unit** 1734 **Examiner Name** Laura Estelle Edwards Total Number of Pages in This Submission 3 Attorney Docket Number 50623.340 (excludina references) ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) Deposit Account 07-1850 After Allowance Communication to **Assignment Papers** (for an Application) Authorization Drawing(s) In/Formal _ Appeal Communication to Board of Sheets with Postage Paid Return Postcard Submission of Drawings Transmittal Appeals and Interferences Issue Fee Transmittal with PTO-85b Appeal Communication to Group Response (pages) (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) (in duplicate) Amendment Transmittal Letter (in Request for Continued Examination Proprietary Information Transmittal (RCE) duplicate) Fee Transmittal Form (in duplicate) Request for Status of Application Affidavits/declaration(s) Power of Attorney, Revocation Other Enclosure(s) Petition for Extension of Time (Change of Correspondence Address (please identify below): month) (in duplicate) Statement Of The Substance Of Information Disclosure Statement Terminal Disclaimer Telephonic Interview on (in duplicate) with Form PTO-1449 December 6, 2004 Request for Refund and ___ References Express Mail Label No. CD, Number of CD(s) ___ EV 337 975 851 US Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. Mark Lupkowski, Reg. No. 49,010 Individual name Signature January 6, 2005 Date **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail # EV 337 974 652 US in an envelope addressed to: BOX AMENDMENTS: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-

1450 on this date: January 6, 2005

Typed or printed name	Patricia Gamble		
Signature	Patricia Sanble	Date	January 6,, 2005
			•



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Examiner: Laura Estelle Edwards

Stephen D. Pacetti et al.

Serial No.:

10/678,979

Art Unit:

1734

Filed:

October 2, 2003

Title:

METHOD FOR SUPPORTING A STENT AND A METHOD OF

USING THE MADREL TO COAT A STENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW ON DECEMBER 6, 2004

Dear Examiner Edwards:

This is a Statement of the Substance of the telephonic interview which occurred on December 6, 2004 regarding the Office Action mailed on September 7, 2004.

Claims discussed

All claims were discussed, in general. Claims 46 and 50 were discussed specifically.

Prior art discussed

Moein (US 6,572,644), Edwin et al. (US 6,245,099), Taylor et al. (US 6,214,115), and Shannon et al. (US, 5,928,279)

Summary of Discussion

The Examiner indicated the claims, in general, were anticipated by the prior art because they were given the most reasonably broad interpretation. In particular, the feature "gear" recited in all of the claims was given a broad interpretation.

Express Mail Label No. EV 337 974 851 US

With respect to claim 46, attorney for the applicant argued that, even with the broad interpretation of the claim, the feature of claim 46 "positioned on the mandrel to support the stent on an inner surface of the stent and to provide sufficient torque to the stent for rotating the stent during a coating process" was not taught by the cited prior art references. The Examiner indicated the feature could not be given patentable weight since there was no structure in the claim to support the feature. She suggested that the above-mentioned feature might be given patentable weight if the claim was amended to include such a structural limitation. The amendment to claim 46 includes such a structural limitation.

With respect to claim 50, attorney for the applicant argued that, even with the broad interpretation, the prior art cited does not teach the underlined portion of the feature "a gear supported by the mandrel having a diameter greater than a diameter of the mandrel and a diameter smaller than an inner diameter of the stent, the gear configured to provide support to the inner surface of the stent during a coating process. Attorney for the applicant indicated that the claim 50 was intended to cover at least the embodiment pictured in FIG. 4 of the application. Examiner suggested that an amendment that included a limitation describing spacing between an outer periphery of the gear and an inner surface of the stent may make the claim patentable. The amendment to claim 50 includes such a limitation.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (415) 954-0297.

Date: January 6, 2005

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP One Maritime Plaza, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111-3492 Telephone: 415.954.0297

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Lupkowski

Reg. No. 49,010

Attorney for Applicant